

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's careful review of the present application, and respectfully request reconsideration in light of the preceding amendments and the following remarks. This Amendment should be entered under Rule 116 because it places this application in condition for allowance.

Applicants thank Examiner Shen for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representatives during the September 7 personal interview. The substance of the interview is incorporated into the remarks below.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 11-13, 15-16, and 23 are amended to better define the claimed invention; and claims 33 is added to provide the scope of protection to which Applicants are believed entitled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-5, 8-13, 15-17, 20-26, and 29-33 are pending for examination in this application.

The indication that the corrected drawings submitted on June 2, 2010, are acceptable by Examiner Shen during the interview is noted with appreciation.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, 11, 23-26, and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pardeep (US 2005/0159158) in view of Wallentin (US 2006/02348706), and further in view of Yu, "Overview of EIA/TIA IS-41," in Proceedings, PIMRC '92., Third IEEE International Symposium on Personal, Indoor and Mobile Radio Communications, 1992. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

In response, independent claim 1 is amended to recite, among other things, "transmitting, during the handover by the first mobile switching center to the second mobile switching center when both of the first mobile switching center to the second mobile switching center are in an invoke state for the handover, a trunk line management message over the dedicated trunk line" and "confirming, during the handover, a status of the dedicated trunk line if the first mobile switching center receives a response corresponding to the transmitted trunk line management message." Pardeep, Wallentin, and Yu fail to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned features.

More specifically, Pardeep describes a handoff solution of a terminal in a GSM communication system and a CDMA communication system using a Hybrid Mobile Switching Center. See Abstract and Fig. 3 of Pardeep. Wallentin describes a method of transmitting a reset message from a control node to a user equipment controlled by the affected control node. See Abstract of Wallentin. Yu describes that IS-41 standard defines Operation, Administration, and Maintenance (OA&M) messages for operating and maintaining the inter-MSC facilities. However, Pardeep, Wallentin, and Yu appear to be silent regarding “transmitting, during the handover . . . a trunk line management message over the dedicated trunk line” and “confirming, during the handover . . . a status of the dedicated trunk line.”

Therefore, for at least the forgoing reason, Pardeep, Wallentin, and Yu, either alone or in combination, fail to render the subject matter of amended independent claim 1 obvious.

Amended independent claim 23 similarly recites a system configured to transmit a trunk lone management message and to receive a response during the handover. Therefore, similar to the reasons presented above for claim 1, claim 23 is believed to be patentable over Pardeep, Wallentin, and Yu. Claims 3-6, 8-9, 11, 24-26, and 29-30 are likewise patentable over applied references for their dependency on claims 1 and 23, respectively. Withdrawal of the rejection under § 103 (a) is respectfully solicited.

Claims 12, 15-17, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanghi (US 2005/0073977) in view of Wallentin, and further in view of Yu. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 12 is amended to recite, among other things, “transmitting, during the handover by the first mobile switching center to the second mobile switching center when both of the first mobile switching center to the second mobile switching center are in an invoke state for the handover, a trunk line management message through an interworking interoperability function unit between the first mobile switching center and the second mobile switching center” and “confirming, during the handover, a status of the dedicated trunk line if the first mobile switching center receives a response corresponding to the transmitted trunk line management message.” Vanghi, Wallentin, and Yu fail to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned features.

More specifically, Vanghi describes various schemes for performing inter-system handoff using an interworking function (IWF). See FIG. 1 of Vanghi.

However, Vanghi appears to be silent regarding “transmitting, during the handover . . . a trunk line management message through an interworking interoperability function unit between the first mobile switching center and the second mobile switching center” and “confirming, during the handover . . . a status of the dedicated trunk line.” Further, similar to the reasons presented above for claim 1, Wallentin, and Yu are silent regarding these features as well.

Therefore, for at least the forgoing reason, Vanghi, Wallentin, and Yu, either alone or in combination, fail to render the subject matter of amended independent claim 12 obvious. Claims 15-17, and 20-21 are likewise patentable over applied references for their dependency on claim 12. Withdrawal of the rejection under § 103 (a) is respectfully solicited.

Claims 10, 13, 22, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Wallentin and Yu in view of one or more of Pardeep, Vanghi, or Sicher (US 5,570,411). After reviewing the cited references, Applicants respectfully submit that Sicher is further relied upon to disclose the additional features recited in claims 10, 22, and 31. However, Sicher fails to at least remedy the deficiencies of Vanghi, Pardeep, Wallentin, and Yu. As such, claims 10, 13, 22, 31, and 32 are believed to be patentable over applied references for at least their dependency on independent claims 1, 12, and 23, respectively. Withdrawal these rejections of claims 10, 13, 22, 31, and 32 under § 103(a) is respectfully solicited.

New Claim

New claim 33 is added to depend from independent claim 23, and thus is believed to be patentable over the applied references.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicants' attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP

/Yoon S Ham/
Yoon S. Ham
Registration No. 45,307

Customer Number: 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: September 17, 2010
YSH/TC/fyk